

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4-8, 12-14 and 21 are pending in this application. Claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14 and 21 were previously withdrawn from consideration. By this Supplemental Amendment, claims 2, 4 and 5 are amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Nguyen in the November 17 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,739,587 to Sato in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,736,791 to Fujiki et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Fujiki et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest "a second conductive layer disposed below said first conductive layer, the second conductive layer having a plurality of openings forming a planar lattice conductive pattern," as recited in claims 2 and 4. As shown in Fig. 1, the recited planar network pattern is shown in a mesh state 130a-130g of a second electrode layer 200. As shown in the plan view of Fig. 2A, the claimed feature of a planar network pattern 130a-130i allows a free current flow between the interstices of the shown mesh state regardless of the orientation of the conductive layer.

Instead, Fujiki et al. discloses a pattern of a first aluminum wiring layer 3 of a stripe-like form in which slit portions 13 of elongated rectangular spaces (horizontal elongated tetragonal prisms) are formed through the wiring layer (col. 9, lines 6-8; Fig. 1). Because Fujiki et al. has slits 13 that are elongated, Fujiki et al. limits the orientation of the first aluminum wiring layer 3 in the orientation of the slits to allow interstitial current flows in

between the slits. The claimed features of the present application do not impose such functional limitations, thus, offer distinct advantages over Fujiki et al.

As discussed during the interview, Sato is disqualified as prior art. Even if considered, Sato does not make up for the deficiencies of Fujiki et al. Sato does not relate to any subject matter regarding a plurality of openings forming a planar lattice network pattern as claimed.

Thus, even if combined, Sato and Fujiki et al. do not combine to result in the recited claim features.

For at least these reasons, Sato cannot be combined with Fujiki et al. to render obvious the subject matter of claims 2, 3, 6 and 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn. Applicants further request that the withdrawn claims be rejoined in view of the claim amendments.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 2-8, 12-14 and 21 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

JAO:RJK/mdw

Date: November 21, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461